

Panaji, 28th July, 1983 (Sravana 6, 1905)

SERIES II No. 17

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

GOVERNMENT OF GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms

Order

No. 3/6/76-PER (Vol. II) (a)

The Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu is pleased to promote and appoint under rule 16 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Civil Service Rules, 1967 read with rule 5(1)(b)(i) of the said rules, the following officers who hold substantive posts included in Schedule II of the Service Rules, to hold Grade II substantive posts included in Schedule I of the Service, with immediate effect:—

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer
---------	---------------------

1. Shri J. M. J. S. Alexandre Pereira.
2. Shri D. S. Sanvordekar.
3. Shri S. S. Byali.
4. Shri R. V. Poi.
5. Shri P. R. Joshi.
6. Shri K. B. Verekar.
7. Shri T. S. Khandeparkar.
8. Shri Damaso Rebelo.

2. The above officers shall be on probation for a period of two years from the date of this order.

3. All the officers including S/Shri Alexandre Pereira, and D. S. Sanvordekar shall continue to hold the present posts held by them until further orders.

4. The names of the officers have been determined in the order of merit by the Selection Committee.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

R. I. Jai Prakash, Joint Secretary.

Panaji, 19th July, 1983.

Order

No. 3/6/76-PER (Vol. II) (b)

The Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu is pleased to promote on officiating basis and appoint under rule 25 (1) (b) of the Goa, Daman and Diu Civil Service Rules, 1967,

the following officers who hold substantive posts included in Schedule II of the Service Rules to hold Grade II duty posts of the Service with immediate effect.

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer
---------	---------------------

1. Shri G. H. Mascarenhas
2. Shri V. A. P. Mahajan
3. Shri J. I. Antani
4. Shri N. D. Vengurlekar
5. Shri M. S. Sail
6. Shri R. V. Durbhatkar
7. Shri K. U. Naik
8. Shri K. N. S. Nair
9. Shri N. P. Gaunekar
10. Shri J. L. T. Lobo
11. Shri B. V. Desai
12. Shri A. P. Panvelkar
13. Shri S. M. Naik
14. Kum. L. T. Menezes
15. Shri S. D. Desai
16. Shri U. D. Kamat
17. Shri D. S. Shirodkar
18. Shri S. D. Sadhale
19. Smt. L. M. Mascarenhas
20. Shri Prabhakar Sardesai
21. Shri R. N. P. N. Sardesai
22. Shri L. J. Menezes Pais
23. Shri A. V. Pimenta
24. Shri X. C. Contoco
25. Shri Vitorino Rodrigues
26. Shri R. G. Jatkar
27. Shri B. S. Nipanikar
28. Shri Lucas Botelho
29. Shri Ashok S. Ingle
30. Shri V. J. Menezes
31. Shri B. S. Panwar
32. Shri S. K. S. Usgaonkar
33. Shri D. P. Anvekar
34. Shri M. N. Bhartiya

Sr. No. Name of the Officer

35.	Shri M. M. Mithbavkar
36.	Shri B. S. Subbanna
37.	Shri J. M. J. R. Almeida
38.	Shri S. B. S. Kakodkar
39.	Shri P. W. Rane Sardesai
40.	Shri Umakant Advolpalkar
41.	Shri Subhash V. Elekar
42.	Shri B. F. Coutinho
43.	Shri S. V. Badri

2. All the above officers including S/Shri V. A. P. Mahajan and R. G. Jatkari but excluding Shri S. V. Badri, shall continue to hold the present posts held by them until further orders.

3. Shri S. V. Badri, Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies, is posted as Under Secretary (Health), Public Health Department, Secretariat thereby relieving Shri P. R. Joshi, Under Secretary (S.E.T.) of his additional charge.

4. The names of the officers have been determined in the order of merit by the Selection Committee.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

R. I. Jai Prakash, Joint Secretary.

Panaji, 19th July, 1983.

Secretariat Administration and Coordination Division

Order

No. 1/2/83-SA&C

The Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu is pleased to issue the following transfers of the Officers borne on the cadre of Mamlatdars/B.D.Os/Enquiry Officers, City Survey with immediate effect:

Sr. No.	Name of the Officer	Present Posting	New Posting
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri A. A. J. de Oliveira	B.D.O. Tiswadi	B.D.O. Bardez vice Shri J. M. de Cunha, transferred.
2.	Shri J. M. de Cunha	B.D.O. Bardez	B.D.O. Tiswadi vice Shri A. A. J. de Oliveira, transferred.

2. Shri A. A. J. de Oliveira, B.D.O., Panaji, shall move first after handing over the charge of the post of B.D.O.

Tiswadi to the Enquiry Officer, City Survey, Panaji, who should look after the duties of B.D.O., Tiswadi, till Shri J. M. de Cunha assumes office as Block Development Officer, Tiswadi.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

G. H. Mascarenhas, Under Secretary (S.A.&C).

Panaji, 19th July, 1983.

Corrigendum

No. 22/1/83-SAC

Read: Order No. 6/3/81-PER dated 27-4-1983.

"The pay scale of Rs. 650-30-70-35-810-EB-35-880-40-1000-EB-1200 indicated in the first paragraph of above referred Order may be read as Rs. 650-30-740-35-810-EB-35-880-40-1000-EB-40-1200."

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

G. H. Mascarenhas, Under Secretary (SA&C).

Panaji, 21st July, 1983.

Works, Education and Tourism Department

Order

No. 5/2/82/WET

Read:— Government Order No. 5/63/78/WET dated 17.12.1979.

On recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee Shri Aleixo Mariano Jacinto Francisco Viegas, Assistant Director on ad-hoc basis in the pay scale of Rs. 650-30-740-35-810-EB-35-880-40-1000-EB-40-1200 is hereby promoted on regular basis with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

T. S. Kandeparkar, Under Secretary to the Government of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Panaji, 20th June, 1983.

Local Administration and Welfare Department

Order

No. 6-13-81-LAWD

The Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu is pleased to transfer the following Group 'B' Officers in the Directorate of Social Welfare, Panaji in public interest, with immediate effect:—

Name of the Officer	Present Posting	New Posting
1	2	3
1. Smt. Sushila D. Amonkar	Child Development Project Officer, Bicholim holding additional charge of Superintendent of Protective Home Bicholim.	Social Welfare Officer in the Directorate of Social Welfare, Panaji vice Smt. Elifa Pereira.
2. Smt. Elifa Pereira	Social Welfare Officer, Directorate of Social Welfare, Panaji.	Child Development Project Officer, Ponda.

Name of the Officer	Present Posting	New Posting
1	2	3
3. Smt. Lalan Shinde	Social Welfare Officer, Directorate of Social Welfare, Panaji.	Child Development Project Officer, Bicholim. She will hold additional charge of Superintendent of Protective Home, Bicholim.
4. Kum. Maria de Ceu Abreu	Child Development Project Officer, Pernem.	Child Development Project Officer, Bardez.
5. Smt. Asha Dalvi	Child Development Project Officer, Satari.	Child Development Project Officer, Pernem.
6. Smt. Ninette O. Fernandes	Child Development Project Officer, Sanguem.	Social Welfare Officer, Dte. of Social Welfare, Panaji, vice Smt. L. Shinde.

2. The Block Development Officers Sanguem and Satari will hold the charge of the post of Child Development Project Officer of Sanguem and Satari respectively in addition to their own duties until further orders.

3. Smt. Asha Dalvi shall move immediately by handing over the charge to the Block Development Officer, Satari. Similarly, Smt. Ninette O. Fernandes shall move immediately by

handing over the charge to the Block Development Officer, Sanguem.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

A. V. Pimenta, Under Secretary to the Govt. of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Panaji, 16th July, 1983.

Revenue Department

Notification

No. 22/135/80-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 22/135/80-RD dated 9-12-80 published on page 592-593 of Series II, No. 39 of the Official Gazette, dated 26-12-80 it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land, specified in the schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") was likely to be needed for the public purpose viz. Distributary D2 S.I.P. Mulem Village Part II.

And Whereas the appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") is satisfied after consi-

dering the report made under sub-section (2) of Section 5A of the said Act, that the said land specified in the schedule hereto is needed to be acquired for the public purpose specified above.

Now, Therefore, the Government is pleased to declare under the provisions of Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government is also pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Special Land Acquisition Officer, Sanguem to perform the functions of a Collector for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land, and to direct him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the said Special Land Acquisition Officer, Sanguem till the award is made under Section 11.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Sr. No.	Taluka	Village/Ward	Survey No.	Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Salcete	Mulem	145	1 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Damu Bhikaro Mangaokar.	2225.00
				2 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Andrew Gracias.	925.00
				4 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Andrew Gracias.	125.00
				9	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Pandurang N. Dessai.	75.00
				12	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Yeshwant N. Dessai.	100.00
				15	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Andreda Fernades.	625.00
				17 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Yeshwant N. Dessai.	50.00
				23 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Pandurang Narayan Dessai.	65.00
				25	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Andrew Gracias.	100.00
				26 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Yeshwant N. Dessai.	75.00
				27 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Pandurang N. Dessai.	20.00
				28	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda. T: Pandurang N. Dessai.	75.00

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Salcete	Mulem	145	29 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda.		175.00
			31	T: Yeshwant N. Dessai.		
				H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda.		100.00
		148	3 part	T: Pandurang N. Dessai.		
				H: Raghuvir Paigunkar.		975.00
			4 part	T: Nagu Ganesh Gaunkar.		
				H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda.		850.00
				T: Maria Mery Gomes.		
			12 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda.		500.00
		144	1 part	H: Xavier Monte D'Silva Miranda.		8650.00
		152	1 part	H: Raghuvir Paigunkar.		15785.00
				T: Babu Sitaram Naik.		
		151	4 part	H: Raghuvir Paigunkar.		10.00
				T: Uttam Nagu Gaunkar.		
			5 part	H: Raghuvir Paigunkar.		300.00
				T: Uttam Nagu Gaunkar.		
			7 part	H: Raghuvir Paigunkar.		125.00
				T: Satu Yessu Gaunkar.		
			8	H: Raghuvir Paigunkar.		175.00
				T: Uttam Nagu Gaunkar.		
			9	H: Raghuvir Paigunkar.		150.00
				T: Satu Yessu Gaunkar.		
			10 part	H: Raghuvir Paigunkar.		150.00
				T: Bombo Ganesh Gaunkar.		
			11 part	H: Irish Silva.		1350.00
				T: Constancio Carvalho.		
			12 part	H: Irish Silva.		5700.00
		211	2 part	H: Inacio Manual D'Miranda.		2275.00
				H: Joquim Fernandes.		
				H: Andrew Faleira.		
				H: Querobin Rodrigues.		
Total						41,730.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

A. S. Ingle, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Panaji, 19th July, 1983.

Notification

No. 22/114/82-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 22/114/82-RD dated 3-9-82 published on page 331-333 of Series II, No. 25 of the Official Gazette dated 16-9-82 it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) that the land specified in the schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the said land) was likely to be needed for public purpose viz. Laying pipeline of 160 MLD Salaulim Water Supply Scheme at Sirvoi Village in Quepem (Additional Area).

And whereas the Government is of the opinion that its acquisition is urgently necessary, the provisions of sub-section (1) and sub-section (4) of Section 17 of the said Act are made applicable and that the Collector appointed under paragraph 2 below, shall at any time, on expiry of 15 days

from the publication of notice relating to the said land under sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the said Act, take possession of the said land.

Now therefore the Government is pleased to declare under the provision of Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government is also pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Special Land Acquisition Officer, Salaulim Irrigation Project, Sanguem to perform the functions of the Collector for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land and to direct him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order of the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the Special Land Acquisition Officer Sanguem till the award is made under Section 11.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Quepem	Sirvoi	82	1 part	H: Bhutto Anant Shirvoikar.	463.00
				T: Jone Thomas Carvalho.	
			2 part	H: 1) Shamba Vasant Shirvoikar.	38.00
				2) Gangadhar Pandurang Shirvoikar.	
				3) Haridatta Bhiva Shirvoikar.	
				4) Anusuya Rajaram Shirvoikar.	
				5) Janardhan Gopal Shirvoikar.	
				6) Somnath Dattaram Shirvoikar.	
				7) Raya Anant Shirvoikar.	
				8) Nilkant Shirvoikar.	
				9) Paulina Lacerda.	
				10) Vishwath Shiram Shirvoikar.	
				11) Ganesh Dharmu Poi Angle.	

1	2	3	4	5	6
Quepem	Sirvoi	82	2 part	12) Gajaram Narayan Shirvoikar. 13) Ramkrishna Govind Shirvoikar. 14) Rudraji Vishwant Shirvoikar. 15) Kashinath Vasant Shirvoikar. 16) Dinanath Vasant Shirvoikar. 17) Ramesh Vaman Shirvoikar. 18) Laximan Rajaram Shirvoikar. 19) Sundharbai Bhikappa Sinai. 20) Uttam Jaivant Nagarsekar. 21) Bhutto Anant Shirvoikar. T: Pedro Sebastino Collaso.	
		79	230 part	H: 1) Vasant Trivikram Cunde. 2) Shambo Vasant Shirvoikar. 3) Gangadhar Pandurang Shirvoikar. 4) Bhuto Anant Shirvoikar. 5) Shankar Anant Shirvoikar. 6) Ghaneshym Anant Shirvoikar. 7) Vishnu Anant Shirvoikar. 8) Raja Anant Shirvoikar. 9) Nikant Fatu Shirvoikar. 10) Paulo Lacorda. 11) Dr. Rudraji Vishwanath Shirvoikar. 12) Uttam Jaiwant Nagarsekar. 13) Sundarbai Bhikppa Sinai. 14) Narayan Pandharinath Shirvoikar. 15) Kashinath Vasant Shirvoikar. 16) Ramesh Vaman Shirvoikar. 17) Vishwanath Shivram Shirvoikar. 18) Gajanana Dharmu Poingle. 19) Gajanana Narayan Shirvoikar. 20) Ram Krishna Govind Shirvoikar. T: Jack Manuel Carvalho.	12.00
		79	269 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Vithu Pandalik Bhandari.	55.00
		79	241 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Francisco Paulo Carvalho.	21.00
			208 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Uttam Baban Bhandari.	15.00
		79	209 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Nagu Pundalik Bhandari.	12.00
		79	210 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Uttam Baban Bhandari.	7.00
		79	244 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Minguel Salu Pishert.	25.00
		79	251 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Jack Manuel Carvalho. 2. Minguel Salu Pishert.	10.00
		79	270 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Nagu Pundalik Bhandari.	25.00
		79	273 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Nagu Pundalik Bhandari.	27.00
		79	271 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Pedro Sebastiao Colaso.	65.00
		79	293 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Jack Manuel Carvalho.	27.00
		79	254 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230.	95.00
		79	370 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Nagu Pundalik Bhandari.	5.00
			299 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: 1. Minguel Salu Pisher. 2. Vithu Pundalik Bhandari.	27.00
			311 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Jose Thomas Carvalho.	40.00
			338 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Francisco Paulo Carvalho.	50.00
			314 part	H: Same as Holiding No. 230. T: Minguel Salu Pishert.	25.00
		79	339 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. 230. T: Jack Manuel Carvalho.	42.00
			359 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. 230. T: Minguel Salu Pishert.	5.00
			340 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. 230. H: Nagu Pundalik Bhandari.	15.00
			341 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Francisco Paulo Carvalho.	12.00
			360 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Vithu Pundalik Bhandari.	45.00
			362 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Minguel Salu Pishut.	35.00
			363 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Jack Manuel Carvalho.	3.00
			364 part	H: Same as Sub. Div. No. 230. T: Minguel Salu Pishut.	34.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
Quepem	Sirvoi	69	72 part	H: Bhutto Anant Shirvoikar. T: Ramachandra Gaunkar.	40.00
			59 part	H: Same as survey No. 82/2. T: Ramachandra Gaunkar.	30.00
		150	9 part	H: 1) Vishwanath Shiram Shirvoikar. 2) Yesso Shirvoikar. 3) Narayan Shirvoikar. 4) Sundarbai Bicopa Sinai. 5) Govind Vishwanath S. Cuncolekhar. T: Vithoba Shambu Gaunkar.	50.00
		125	14 part	H: Cattao Costa. North: Survey No. 44/83, 81, 82, 79, 69, 70, 72, 75, 150, 157, 158, 130, 12, 129 & 125. South: Survey No. 44, 83, 81, 82, 79, 69, 70, 72, 75, 150, 157, 158, 130, 129 & 125. East: Village boundary of Molcarnem villages. West: River.	1490.00
Total					2845.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

A. S. Ingle, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Panaji, 19th July, 1983.

Notification

No. 22/85/83-RD

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for the public purpose viz. Construction of diversion road from Sircaim to Sirigao (Additional area).

And Whereas in the opinion of the Government the provisions of Sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) are applicable.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under Sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

The Government is pleased to direct under Sub-section (4) of Section 17 of the said Act that the provisions of Section 5A of the said Act shall not apply in respect of the said land.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, lease, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced, or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification,

will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL) Altinho, Panaji to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act, in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under Sub-section (2) of Section (4) of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL), Altinho, Panaji.
3. The Executive Engineer, Roads & Bridges, North II, P.W.D. Panaji.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (CELL), Altinho, Panaji, from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Survey No.	Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Bardez	Sircaim	38	24	H: Comunidade. T: Sakaram Babli Naik.	185.00
			25	H: Fr. Antonio E. D'Souza.	125.00
			26	H: Comunidade.	350.00
		37	1 part	H: Emco Goa Pvt. Ltd. North: Road. South: Road. East: S. No. 38/4. West: Road.	270.00
Bardez	Assonora	28	35	H: Comunidade. T: Rama B. Gaocar.	200.00
			37 part	H: Comunidade.	25.00
		29	25 part	H: Comunidade. T: Ramchandra B. Sawant.	650.00
			26 part	H: Comunidade. T: Olimpio D'Mendes.	150.00

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bardez	Assonora	29	27 part	H: Comunidade. T: Rusario E. Ferrao.	540.00
			28 part	H: Comunidade. T: Bernandina E. Mendes.	460.00
			29 part	H: Comunidade. T: Albina P. D'Souza.	400.00
			30 part	H: Comunidade. T: Annie S. Mendez.	280.00
			31 part	H: Comunidade. T: Rogaciana Menezes.	300.00
			15 part	H: Vitorina Maniyar. T: Sonu P. Salgaokar.	50.00
			16 part	H: Vitorina Mencar. T: Popat P. Salgaokar.	20.00
			17 part	H: Vitorina Mencar. T: Atmaram N. Salgaocar.	20.00
		43	3	H: Comunidade. T: Laxman Babli G. Kalangutkar.	95.00
			24	H: Comunidade. T: Fermu Ferrao.	140.00
			25 part	H: Comunidade. T: Amrog Mendez.	130.00
			26 part	H: Comunidade. T: Chandrakant J. Salgaocar.	130.00
			27 part	H: Comunidade. T: Curcia D'Souza.	170.00
			28 part	H: Comunidade. T: Salu D'Souza.	345.00
			29 part	H: Comunidade. T: Rumald D'Souza.	165.00
			30 part	H: Comunidade. T: Datta Vitu Chodankar.	250.00
			31 part	H: Comunidade. T: Joao Ferrao.	180.00
			32 part	H: Comunidade. T: Vaman G. Naik.	230.00
		42	56	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaocar.	100.00
			1	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Fermu Ferrao.	380.00
			2 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Joao F. Ferrao.	320.00
			3 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Dhameshri N. Salgaocar.	200.00
			4 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaocar.	215.00
			5 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Mahadev V. Salgaocar.	185.00
			6 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaocar.	125.00
			7 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Gopal G. Salgaocar.	185.00
			8 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Floriana Vaz.	165.00
			9 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Jose V. Vaz.	155.00
			10 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Jose Salvador Ferrao.	185.00
			11 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Florencio Vaz.	350.00
			12 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Jaidev Appa Salgaokar.	210.00
			13 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Dhameshri N. Salgaokar.	235.00
			14 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Vaman G. Salgaokar.	180.00
			15 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaokar.	180.00
			16 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Mahadev V. Salgaokar.	195.00
			17 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Jose George Vaz.	180.00
			18 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Mahadev V. Salgaokar.	155.00
			19 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Jose George Vaz.	125.00
			20 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Harichandra V. Salgaokar.	125.00
			21 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Gopal G. Salgaokar.	130.00
			22 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaokar.	140.00
			23 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Jaidev Appa Salgaokar.	140.00
				H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Florino Vaz.	

1	2	3	4	5	6
Bardez	Assocora	42	24 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Joao S. Ferrao.	155.00
			25 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Mahadev V. Salgaokar.	155.00
			34 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Harichandra Salgaokar.	145.00
			35 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Florenco Vaz.	105.00
			36 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaokar.	105.00
			37 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Dharma L. Salgaokar.	125.00
			38 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Vaman G. Salgaokar.	125.00
			39 part	H: Oletino F. Rocha. T: Jaidev Appa Salgaokar.	105.00
			40 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Florenco Vaz.	220.00
			41 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Jose Jeorge Vaz.	110.00
			42 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Florenco Vaz.	80.00
			43 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Mahadev V. Salgaokar.	75.00
			44 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaokar.	85.00
			45 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Gopal G. Salgaokar.	90.00
			46 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaokar.	110.00
			47 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Dhameshri N. Salgaokar.	100.00
			48 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: S. Ferrao.	155.00
			49 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Jose George Vaz.	85.00
			50 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Florenco Vaz.	85.00
			51 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Mahadev V. Salgaokar.	60.00
			52 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Harichandra L. Salgaokar.	60.00
			53 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Vaman G. Salgaokar.	85.00
			54 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Dharma L. Salgaokar.	80.00
			55 part	H: Oletina F. Rocha. T: Jaidev Appa Salgaokar.	185.00
		59	1 part	H: Eucario D'Souza. T: Harichandra R. Govekar.	60.00
			2 part	H: Comunidade.	80.00
				North: S. No. 29, Sub. Div. No. 15 to 17, 25 to 31, S. No. 43, Sub. Div. No. 3, 24 to 32, S. No. 42, Sub. Div. No. 1 to 56, S. No. 38, Sub. Div. No. 9 to 11.	
				South: S. No. 40/15, S. No. 33, Sub. Div. No. 1 and S. No. 41/77 Sub. Div. No. 1 to 4 and 56, S. No. 59, Sub. Div. 1 to 2.	
				East: S. No. 23, Sub. Div. Nos. 18, 32 and 33, Nalla.	
				West: Nalla.	
Total					13295.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

A. S. Ingle, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Panaji, 16th July, 1983.

Industries and Labour Department

Order

No. 28/2/79-ILD

The following Awards given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu are hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. D. Sadhale, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 7th July, 1983.

**IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOA,
DAMAN AND DIU, PANAJI**

(Before Dr. Renato de Noronha, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No.: IT/62/82

1. Shri Janmiya Sattar Gani — Workman/Party I
V/s.

1. M/s. J. P. Nunes & Sons — Employer/Party II
Employer/Party II represented by Shri P. K. Lele, Labour Advisor.

Panaji. Dated: 27-6-1983

AWARD

This is a reference made to this Tribunal by the Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, by its order No. 28/31/82-ILD dated 22-10-1982. The schedule annexed to the order or reference reads as follows:

"Whether the action of the Management of M/s J. P. Nunes and Sons, Panaji-Goa in terminating the services of Shri Janmiya Sattar Gani, Conductor w. e. f. 1-4-79 is legal and justified?

If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. Notice was sent to both the parties to file their statements. The workman, although duly served, did not file any statement of claim, nor did he remain present on the date fixed. The employer filed its written statement, in which it is stated as follows:

The employer is a partnership concern engaged in the business of passenger transport in the territory of Goa, Daman and Diu. They engage various categories of workers such as drivers, conductors etc., for their buses.

They had engaged the first party, Shri Janmiya Sattar Gani (hereinafter referred to as the workman) as a bus conductor in their organisation in April 1976, who continued to work with them till April 1979, when he voluntarily remained absent.

It is a fact that, while discharging his duties, the workman was caught and fine was imposed on him on several occasions by the traffic police for violating some provisions of traffic rules, mainly carrying excess passengers. The workman never informed the employer about these violations or the fine imposed on him till March 1979. When the employer received notice from the R. T. O. authorities asking him to explain as to why action should not be taken against him (employer) for repeated violations of traffic regulations, the workman got scared of this notice, which was now served on the employer, and remained absent without leave or intimation.

Though the workman remained absent, he wrote a letter dated 23rd April, 1979 to the employer making false allegations that he was not provided employment by the employer. He also claimed reinstatement in service. Annexure 'A' hereto is a copy of the said letter of the workman.

The employer received on 23-4-79 this letter Ex 'A' making false allegations and promptly wrote the reply, denying the allegations and also directing the workman to report for duties immediately, without wasting any time. This letter dated 30th April, 1979 was sent to the workman by Regd. A. D. post, annexed Ex 'B' is a copy of the said

letter. The workman duly received this letter and the postal authorities returned the acknowledgement receipt duly signed by the workman.

In spite of the fact that the workman had received the letter Ex 'B', he did not report for duties. On the contrary, he, through his union, All Goa Motor Transport Workers Federation raised Industrial dispute before Assistant Labour Commissioner, Shri B. B. Naik. The Assistant Labour Commissioner took up this dispute as per his file No. IRM/CON/(63)/79 and called the parties for discussions. The employer's representative attended and explained the fact that he had not terminated the services and, as such, there was no dispute. The Assistant Labour Commissioner and the Union were satisfied and they advised the workman to resume duties and the file was accordingly closed, as there was no dispute.

7. The workman again failed to resume duties. But, it appears, raised fresh dispute, this time before another Assistant Labour Commissioner, Shri Mardolkar. The Workman did not raise any dispute with the employer this time. When the employer received notice from the Assistant Labour Commissioner to attend the conciliation, he brought to the notice of the Assistant Labour Commissioner that the dispute was disposed off earlier and that, if there is any fresh demand, the employer should know what the demand was. The employer also brought attention of the A.L.C. to the fact that the employer had not terminated the services of the workman. The employer sent two letters to the A. L. C. on these points on 25-3-80 and 21-8-80 annexed as Ex 'C' 1 & 2 are the copies of the said letter. The employer informed the A. L. C. that no purpose would be served in attending the conciliation proceedings.

In spite of these two letters and even after making it clear that the workman had not raised the fresh dispute with the employer, the conciliation officer submitted his failure report and now the Government has made the present reference to the Hon. Tribunal.

The employer respectfully submits that he has never terminated the services of the workman. The history narrated above rather elaborately is to draw the attention of the Hon. Tribunal to the fact that the employer had asked the workman to resume duties, that the Assistant Labour Commissioner when the dispute was raised first time had directed the workman to attend duties and yet the workman did not resume duties.

The employer reliably understands that the workman has found alternate employment and as such has volunteered to remain absent and has unnecessarily alleged that it is employer who has terminated his services.

3. The employer also gave oral evidence before this Tribunal confirming all the facts stated in its written statement and produced documents in proof of them.

4. From the above evidence, I am satisfied that it is the workman who abandoned the services of the employer and not the employer who terminated the services of the workman. This is my answer to the above reference. No order as to costs.

Dr. Renato de Noronha
Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal

**IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOA,
DAMAN AND DIU, PANAJI-GOA**

(Before Dr. Renato de Noronha, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No.: IT/43/75

1. Shri Shaikh Abdul R. Muzavoor — Workman/Party I
V/s.

1. M/s. Society of Transport — Employer/Party II
Workman/Party I represented by Shri George Vaz, Union Leader.

Employer/Party II represented by Shri A. A. Jog, Labour Advisor.

Panaji. Dated: 17-6-1983

AWARD

This is a reference made to this Tribunal by the Govt. of Goa, Daman & Diu, by its order No. LG/1/LD(97)/71(77)/72 dated 22-3-1973. The schedule annexed to the order of reference reads as follows:

"Whether M/s. Society of Transport Panjim-Margao, Panaji, is justified in suspending Mr. Sheikh Abdul Rehman Muzawar from service with effect from 16-9-1971 and subsequently terminating his services with effect from 1-4-1972.

If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. The case of the workman, as per his statement of claim, is that he was employed by the employer/society as a bus driver on the Panaji-Margao route with a monthly salary of Rs. 140/- per month plus Rs. 4/- per day as food allowance. The immediate cause of action for his suspension and subsequent termination of services is: he was issued memo on 16-9-1971 and suspended from duty; the workman replied to the memo by his letter dated 21-9-1971; a charge sheet dated 11-11-1971 was issued to him along with letter dated 3-12-1971 and by letter dated 31-12-1971 he was informed regarding the domestic inquiry to be held against him by Adv. Madevarao; this inquiry was only a show of inquiry and was held in violation of the principles of natural justice, with statements of the complainant and his witness obtained in advance behind the back of the workman, who was only asked to cross the said witnesses regarding such statements; the services of the workman were terminated by the president of the society w.e.f. 1-4-1972 and he was denied subsistence allowance during 6 and a half months of his suspension. It is submitted that the termination of his services is malafide, without a proper inquiry and, therefore, should be set aside. The workman has been for all this period mostly unemployed. He has prayed that he be reinstated from the date of his suspension i.e. 16-9-1971, with full back wages and other benefits, as on duty.

3. The employer, in its written statement, has stated that, on 15-9-1971, the workman was driving bus No. GDT 1831, which he dashed against another bus, parked at Panaji bus stand, while taking out the same from the stand. It was the negligent and reckless driving by the workman which caused damage to the society bus as well as to the other bus. The workman was issued a show cause notice, calling for his explanation. He replied to the notice denying his fault but his explanation was not found satisfactory and he was issued a charge sheet, incorporating the incident of 15-9-1971 along with other incidents of the past. An inquiry was held in which the workman fully participated. He was given an opportunity to defend himself. The I.O. submitted his findings, based on the evidence recorded. The company concurred with the findings of the I.O. and terminated the services of the workman from 1-4-1972 (vide letter dated 28-3-1972). While coming to this conclusion, the company also took into account the past record of the workman. It is submitted that the misconduct committed by the workman, being grave and serious, the punishment imposed on him is proper and, therefore, the action taken by the Management is bonafide, legal and justified.

4. The workman, in his rejoinder, has maintained the stand taken in his statement of claim, denying that he was driving the bus GDT 1831 in a negligent and reckless manner.

5. The employer, by its application dated 22-1-1977, sought permission of the Tribunal to lead fresh evidence, as it did not want to rely upon the inquiry held against the workman, which evidence was led by both the parties before the Tribunal, in open court.

The evidence led by the employer consists of evidence of one Augusto Pereira and Lawrence D'Souza and the evidence of the workman consists of his own evidence and of one Krishna Mangeshkar.

6. Augusto Pereira is the conductor of the bus No. GDT 2268, involved in the collision with the society bus, driven by the workman. He has stated that his bus and the society bus were both standing adjacent to each other in the old bus stand, near the post office. Society's bus was to the left of his bus. The workman started the society bus and wheeled his bus to the right sharply and thus hit the front bumper of his bus damaging the same. The workman did not stop his bus immediately after hitting the other bus, but drove away for about 2 seconds and stopped. The witness then

went to one Desai of the society and informed him. Desai came to the spot and saw the damage to his bus. Photos were also taken. Exh. M-1 and M-2 are the photos taken at that time. In his cross, he has stated that, at the time of collision, the driver of his bus, Vinayak, had gone out to have tea. His bus had returned from a trip from Margao at about 12.30 noon. The accident took place at 12.30 noon. He has denied the suggestion that the society bus was stationary and that his bus, while reversing to keep it stationary at the stand, hit the rear mudguard of the society bus. The buses were in the same condition as shown in the photos from the time of the accident till about 1.30 p.m. Shri Desai of the Society was at the Netravalkar Petrol Pump, when the witness reported to him about the accident. The workman was also with him at that time; the society bus was driven away from the spot at about 1.30 p.m. when Mr. Desai allowed the bus to go. The witness took his bus to Margao at about 2.30 p.m. tying the broken bumper with a rope. He asked for damages from the society but Mr. Desai told him that he would file a case against his driver and then pay to the witness, but so far nothing has been paid. The back part of the society bus hit the bumper of his bus; the conductor Lawrence of the society bus was present when the accident took place.

7. The next witness Lawrence D'Souza was working as conductor of the society bus. He has stated that the workman in question was the driver of the bus involved in the accident. This bus along with the bus of another transport company was standing in front of the post office. The bus driven by the workman was on the left, while the other was on the right, if one faces the post office. At the time of the accident, the witness was having his tea in a nearby tea shop, somebody said that there was an accident; so he went to the place; the bus driven by the workman was seen taking a turn to the right and in the process hitting the other bus that was alongside. Exh. M-1 and M-2 are the photos of the two buses involved in the accident. In his cross, he has stated that the number of the bus driven by the workman was GDT 1831 and the other bus is 2268; in the tea shop, the owner of the bus was also sitting along with the witness; he has denied the suggestion that bus No. 2268 was being reversed and in the process the front portion hit the mudguard of the society bus. The witness was at the place of the accident for about 10 minutes and then he was sent as conductor in the bus No. 2177. The society bus had a slight scratch on the hind side and on the tyre; the bus driven by the workman was to ply on Panaji-Miramar route and the other bus, which belongs to Menino Jesus Transport, had to go to Margao. The photos M-1 and M-2 were not taken in the presence of the witness. The driver of the bus 2268 was not there when the witness went to the site of the accident. The workman was there observing the damage caused.

8. The workman Sheikh Abdul Muzawar has stated that he was the driver of the bus 1831 which was involved in the accident on 16-9-1971 at about 1.30 p.m. or 1.45 p.m. On that date, the workman was to leave on that bus to Miramar to pick up college students; the other bus had to leave for Margao at 2.00 p.m.; both the buses were standing side by side in front of the post office; the starting point for the other bus was on the river side, while the workman's bus had to start from near the post office only. At about 1.30 p.m. or 1.45 p.m. the other bus driver started moving towards the river for proceeding towards his starting point; the workman's bus was stationary and the workman was sitting in it. While the other bus was being reversed, the front bumper of that bus touched the hind mudguard of the workman's bus; one Vinayak was the driver of the other bus; as soon as the other bus touched the workman's bus the workman got down from the bus and so did Vinayak; then Vinayak went and brought his proprietor Augusto. Augusto and Vinayak came there and told the workman to allow their bus to be taken away from there, as it had to go to Margao. The workman's bus had no major damage and the matter could be settled amicably. The workman went to the Petrol Pump where the President of the Society was, and reported the matter to him. He told him to have a Panchanama prepared and remove the bus. So he went away to the office of the Society at Junta House, but there was nobody there; then he went to the garage to find the secretary, but he was not there; so he came in front of the post office, but by that time the other bus had been already removed from the place. He came to know that photos were taken of the two buses. The two buses were standing parallel to each other. The Margao bus starting point was in the hind direction, by the side of the river. The workman took his bus at 2.30 p.m. to Miramar; no police report or any other case has been

filed against him. Later, at 4 p.m., he was given a letter of suspension and dismissed by letter dated 28-3-1972 after an inquiry. He has made various allegations against the fairness of the inquiry, which are not relevant in our case, as the said inquiry has not been relied upon by the employer. In his cross, he has stated that his reply Exh. M-3 to the memo of 15-9-1971 was drafted by an Advocate to whom he narrated the whole incident. The Advocate read out and explained to him the contents of the reply. Exh. M-4 is the correct rough sketch of the scene of the accident; Exh. M-6 and M-11 do not bear his signature; he did not receive M-7 and M-9; he was once convicted for a bus accident by the Ponda Court; he has denied the suggestion that the accident took place when he was taking his bus forward and that the other bus was stationary at that time. He has further denied that taking the bus on reverse was not permitted on that road, it being one way traffic.

9. Shri Krishna Mangeshkar is the only witness examined by the workman in his defence. He has stated that he used to sell bananas at the old bus stand, near the post office; he remembers the accident that took place 7-8 years ago. The bus of the workman was at the bus stand and the other bus was behind; the bus at the back was being taken on reverse and in the process hit the hind portion of the bus; the bus of the workman was stationary. In his cross, he has stated that when he was busy selling bananas he heard the sound of collision and then he went to see what happened; he only saw that there was a collision between 2 buses and people were saying that the other bus was reversing and the collision took place; he does not remember who told him about this.

10. This is all the evidence led by the parties in this case. Exh. M-3 is the reply of the workman to the memo dated 16-11-1971, issued by the society to the workman in connection with this accident. The workman, in his cross, has stated that the said reply was drafted by an advocate to whom he narrated all the facts and that the same was read out and explained to him by the said advocate. The version of the collision as given by the workman in this reply is as follows:

"While I was taking out the bus No. GDT 1831 the said bus No. GDT 2268 suddenly came and tried to enter for stationing. As I was taking out the bus, it was his duty to stop entering until I took out the bus, what he did not do. As a result the rear wheel of the bus I was driving touched the part of the bumper of the bus No. 2268, which was out of place due to some previous accident.

I immediately stopped the bus and went to inform the fact to the society and the society without drawing any Panchanama or preliminary inquiry on the matter on the spot allowed the bus No. 2268 to move, with a result that I was restrained from establishing my defence."

This version, however, differs from the one given by the workman in his statement before the Tribunal, wherein he has stated as follows: "My bus was standing in front of the post office. By the side of my bus there was another bus stationary. The other bus had to leave at 2 p.m. for Margao. The starting point for the other bus was on the river side while my bus had to start from near the post office only. At 1.30 or 1.45 p.m. the other bus driver started moving towards the river for going towards his starting point. I had been sitting in my bus and it was stationary. While that bus was being reversed, the front bumper of that bus touched to the hind bumper of my bus. One Vinayak was the driver of the other bus."

In Exh. M-3 the workman has admitted that he was moving his bus when the collision took place, which fact is also asserted by the employer's witnesses Augusto Pereira and Lawrence D'Souza. The workman has changed the version given in Exh. M-3 in his statement before the Tribunal, wherein he has stated that both the buses were stationary, side by side, and that it is the employers bus that was reversing and in the process hit the workman's bus. This version of the workman, however, besides contradicting his earlier version as per Exh. M-3, is not supported by any evidence. The only witness examined by the workman is one banana vendor, who has not seen the facts and whatever he has deposed is heresay evidence, which is not confirmed by any other independent witness.

11. From the evidence led by the employer, coupled with the contradictory evidence given by the workman, I am con-

vinced that the collision occurred due to the negligence of the workman, who did not take the necessary precaution while reversing his bus.

12. Now, considering the penalty imposed by the employer on the workman:

The workman has admitted in his statement before the Tribunal the receipt of the notice Exh. E-5, but denied that Exh. M-6 is his reply to Exh. M-5. If Exh. M-6 is not the reply of the workman, it was his duty to put before the Tribunal such reply, which he has failed to do. I am led to believe that Exh. M-6 is the reply of the workman, in which he has prayed to the Management to condone him for his fault.

13. The workman has also admitted that he was once convicted by the Ponda Court for a bus accident.

14. Exh. M-8 dated 13-6-1968 is admitted by the workman. In this exhibit he apologises for having spoken abusive words to the Management in the office of the society and prayed that a lenient view be taken.

15. Exh. M-10 dated 6-4-1971 is also admitted by the workman. In this Exhibit the workman refers to the receipt of the letter Exh. M-11, but in his statement before the Tribunal the workman has denied his signature below Exh. M-11. From Exh. M-10 and M-11 it is clear that the Management issued a show cause notice to the workman for having absented himself without intimation after signing the muster roll.

16. All the above facts would be sufficient, in my view, to justify the penalty of dismissal imposed by the employer on the workman.

17. In these circumstances, I reply to the reference as follows:

The action of M.S. Society of Transport Panaji-Margao in suspending the workman Sheikh Abdul Rehman Muzawar from services w.e.f. 16-9-1971 and, subsequently, terminating his services w.e.f. 1-4-1972 is justified. I leave each party to bear its own costs.

Dr. Renato de Noronha
Presiding Officer
Industrial Tribunal

Order

No. 28/9/82-ILD

Whereas the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employer of M/s. Bharat Goa Fruit Distilleries, Nanora-Goa and their workmen represented through the Goa Trade and Commercial Workers' Union, Assonora in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule annexed hereto (hereinafter referred to as to the 'said dispute').

And whereas the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa, Daman and Diu, Panaji constituted under section 7-A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the striking of the names of S/Shri Keshav Gawas, Anil Pedneker, Satyawan Mayekar and Gopal Gawas unskilled mazdoors, from the rolls with effect from 16-3-82 by the employer M/s. Bharat Goa Fruit Distilleries, Nanora-Goa is justified?

If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. D. Sadhale, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).
Panaji, 13th July, 1983.

Notification

No. 28/20/80-ILD

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu, being satisfied that public interest so required, hereby declares the Milk Supply Scheme of the Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, to be a 'Public Utility

Service' for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa,
Daman and Diu.

S. D. Sadhale, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 20th July, 1983.